Camouflage Treatment of Skeletal Class III Malocclusion with Anterior Crossbite in Adults- A Case Series

Aniruddh V Yashwant¹, UB Rajasekaran², Helen Rachel Xavier³, Lijin James⁴, Basil Joseph⁵

¹(Senior Lecturer, Department Of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, Indira Gandhi Institute of Dental Sciences, Sri BalajiVidyapeeth, Puducherry, India)
²(Professor and Head, Department Of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, Indira Gandhi Institute of Dental Sciences, Sri BalajiVidyapeeth, Puducherry, India)
³(Post Graduate Student, Department Of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, Indira Gandhi Institute of Dental Sciences, Sri BalajiVidyapeeth, Puducherry, India)
⁴(Post Graduate Student, Department Of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, Indira Gandhi Institute of Dental Sciences, Sri BalajiVidyapeeth, Puducherry, India)
⁵(Post Graduate Student, Department Of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopaedics, Indira Gandhi Institute of Dental Sciences, Sri BalajiVidyapeeth, Puducherry, India)

Corresponding Author: Aniruddh V Yashwant

Abstract: In the current scenario, different treatment modalities exist when orthodontic camouflage needs to be done in patients with mild or moderate skeletal Class III malocclusions. Recent advances such as temporary anchorage devices increased the scope of camouflage treatment. This series of cases describes the nonsurgical management of skeletal Class III malocclusion using treatment mechanics, which efficiently improve the functional occlusion and esthetic requirements of the patient.
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I. Introduction

The correction of Skeletal and Dental Class III malocclusion is a challenge to the orthodontist in relation to the diagnosis, treatment planning and treatment mechanics. The amount and direction of growth in Class III patients decides the need for orthodontic and surgical approaches.¹ Class III relationship may result from a normal maxilla with mandibular skeletal protrusion or a maxillary retrusion with normal mandible or a combination of both.² An anterior crossbite can worsen with age which significantly affects facial esthetics and the function of the stomatognathic system. The etiology of Class III malocclusion is multifactorial because of the involvement of genetics, ethnicity, environmental factors, and habitual postures. The age preference for the treatment of an anterior crossbite is between 8–9 years.

Class III malocclusion patient can have a concave facial profile, and the lower lip protrusive to the upper lip. Pseudo Class III malocclusion is a condition developed by premature contact during the normal path of closure of the mandible and this can lead to the anteriodisplacement of the mandible.³ The etiologic factors of Class III malocclusion are genetic, environmental factors, and oral function.⁴ The treatment of choice for an adult patient with a severe skeletal Class III malocclusion and a midline deviation is usually combined surgical and orthodontic treatment. Orthodontic camouflage is the masking of skeletal discrepancies through extractions and orthodontic treatment, instead of correcting them. Therefore, dentoalveolar compensation is made without correcting the basal dysplasia.⁵

Patients with borderline malocclusions are usually treated with camouflage treatment with selective extractions. However, we sometimes treat patients with severe problems who do not want surgery as a part of their treatment plans.⁶ In cases treated by orthodontic camouflage, the dental movements are often the opposite of those necessary prior to surgery, where dentoalveolar decompenasating is the objective. Orthodontic camouflage treatment should be prescribed for young adults only if, before treatment begins, there are cephalometric indications that residual growth will not provoke a worsening of the deformity after treatment, causing dentofacial asymmetry. Camouflage treatment also implies that the tooth repositioning will have a favourable effect or at least be less damaging to the facial esthetics.⁷ Here, we report a nonsurgical treatment approach with simplified treatment mechanics and its outcome for two adult patients with skeletal Class III malocclusion.

DOI: 10.9790/0853-1804161822 www.iosrjournals.org 18 | Page
II. Case Report-1

Diagnosis
A female patient of age 20 years reported with a complaint of irregularly arranged lower front teeth. On extraoral examination, the patient had mesocephalic head form, leptoprosopic facial form, straight profile, anterior divergence, and protruded lower lips. On intraoral examination, the patient had an anterior crossbite in relation to 11, 21 and 22, lower crowding and Class I molar and canine relationship, proclined maxillary anterior teeth, forwardly placed upright mandibular teeth, upper and lower anterior crowding with reverse overjet of 2 mm.

On cephalometric evaluation, the patient had a skeletal Class III base with normal maxilla and prognathic mandible on average growth pattern. On soft tissue analysis, the lower lip was protrusive and obtuse nasolabial angle. The model analysis showed that the Bolton’s excess was 2.8 mm and increased tooth size arch length discrepancy of 1 mm in lower arch. (Figure 1-5)

Treatment objectives
1. Correction of anterior crossbite
2. Correction of crowding
3. To obtain ideal overjet and overbite
4. To obtain ideal esthetics.

Treatment alternatives
The first treatment option was Surgical Orthodontics: Pre-surgical leveling and alignment, Lefort I osteotomy in maxillary arch and Bilateral sagittal split osteotomy (BSSO) in the mandibular arch and post-surgical orthodontics.
Second treatment option was camouflage treatment with mandibular incisor extraction.

Treatment plan
Since the patient was not willing for surgery and procedures which involved use of TADs, orthodontic camouflage treatment was decided to be performed with mandibular single incisor extraction and contemporary MBT mechanics. Following correction of anterior crossbite using posterior bite plane, mandibular anterior would be retracted just enough to achieve ideal overjet and overbite.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Comparison of pre and post-treatment cephalometric values of case 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNA angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNB angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANB angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoGn to SN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1 to NA angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1 to NA (linear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 to NB (linear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 to mandibular plane angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interincisal angle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Treatment progress
0.022” slot MBT brackets were bonded on the upper and lower arches with bilateral fixed posterior acrylic bite plane on the lower molar region. Leveling and alignment was started with 0.016 nickel titanium (NiTi) followed by sequence of rectangular NiTiarch wires in the upper and lower arches. After leveling and alignment, space closure was done with 0.019 × 0.025 SS. Setting of occlusion was done with 0.019 × 0.025” stainless steel wire in upper and lower anterior tooth and vertical settling elastics in posterior. Retention was given with a removable Hawley’s retainer in the upper arch and canine-to-canine bonded fixed retainer in the lower arch.

Treatment results
Post treatment records showed good alignment of the upper and lower arches. An esthetically acceptable smile arc was achieved due to the correction of the upper anterior crossbite. There was a good occlusion between the upper and lower arches with ideal intercuspation of the posterior teeth.
**III. Case Report - 2**

**Diagnosis**

A 21 year old male patient came with complaint of irregularly arranged upper front teeth region. On extra oral examination, the patient had brachycephalic head form, euryprosopic facial form, concave profile, anterior divergence and protruded lower lips. On intraoral examination, the patient had anterior crossbite in relation to 12 and 22, mild upper anterior crowding, spacing of upper and lower anteriors, class III molar and caninerelationships, forwardly placed upright mandibular teeth with overjet of 1 mm. On cephalometric evaluation, the patient had a skeletal Class III base due to prognathic mandible on horizontal growth pattern. Regarding soft tissue profile, the upper and lower lips were protrusive with acute nasolabial angle. (Figure-6-12). The model analysis showed that the Bolton’s excess was 5.2 mm and increased tooth size arch length discrepancy of 3 mm spacing in lower arch.

**Treatment objectives**

1. Correction of anterior crossbite
2. Correction of crowding
3. Correction of spacing
4. Correction of proclination
5. To achieve class I molar and canine relationship
6. To obtain ideal overjet and overbite
7. To obtain ideal esthetics.

**Treatment alternatives**

The first treatment option was Surgical Orthodontics: Pre surgical leveling and alignment, reduction of proclination in maxillary arch with extraction of premolars and decompensation followed by Bilateral sagittal split osteotomy (BSSO) and post-surgical orthodontics.

Second option was use of Miniplate assisted camouflage treatment of Class III malocclusion by en masse distalization of mandibular dentition.

Third treatment option was camouflage treatment with extraction of maxillary second and mandibular first premolars and mini implant supported retraction of anterior teeth.

Fourth treatment option was camouflage treatment with mandibular incisor extraction.

**Treatment plan**

Since the patient was not willing for surgery and procedures which involved use of TADs, orthodontic camouflage treatment was decided to be performed with mandibular single incisor extraction and contemporary MBT mechanics(Treatment option IV). Following correction of anterior crossbite using posterior bite plane, mandibular anteriors would be retracted just enough to achieve ideal overjet and overbite.

**Table 2.** Comparison of pre and post-treatment cephalometric values of case 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Pretreatment</th>
<th>Post treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNA angle</td>
<td>81°</td>
<td>81°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNB angle</td>
<td>83°</td>
<td>82°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANB angle</td>
<td>-2°</td>
<td>-1°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoGn to SN</td>
<td>18°</td>
<td>21°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1 to NA angle</td>
<td>43°</td>
<td>27°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1 to NA (linear)</td>
<td>12 mm</td>
<td>7 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 to NB angle</td>
<td>38°</td>
<td>38°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 to NB (linear)</td>
<td>9 mm</td>
<td>5 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interincisal angle</td>
<td>97°</td>
<td>125°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 to mandibular plane angle</td>
<td>102°</td>
<td>92°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper lip to S line</td>
<td>7 mm</td>
<td>2 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower lip to S line</td>
<td>10 mm</td>
<td>6 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treatment progress**

0.022” slot MBT brackets were bonded on the upper and lower arches with bilateral fixed posterior acrylic bite plane on the lower molar region. Leveling and alignment was started with 0.016 nickel titanium (NiTi) followed by sequence of rectangular NiTiarchwires in the upper and lower arches. After leveling and alignment, space closure was done with 0.019 x 0.025 SS. Settling of occlusion was done with 0.019 x 0.025” stainless steel wire in upper and lower anterior tooth and vertical settling elastics in posterior.
Treatment results

Posttreatment records showed good alignment of the upper and lower arches. An esthetically acceptable smile arc was achieved after the correction of the upper anterior crossbite. There was a good occlusion between the upper and lower arches and good intercuspation of the posterior teeth.

IV. Discussion

The etiological factors in development of Class III malocclusion include both anteroposterior and vertical maxillary deficiency. If the length of the maxillary base is small or if the maxilla is positioned posteriorly, the effect is direct. If it has not proportionately grown vertically, there is an indirect effect on the mandible, which then rotates upward and forward producing an appearance of mandibular prognathism.

For class III correction in adults, if camouflage were planned, typical extractions might be lower first premolars alone, lower first and upper second premolars, or one lower incisor. Combined surgical and orthodontic treatment is the other option of class III correction in adult patients.

In this case series, simplified treatment modalities were designed based on patient’s treatment preference and extend of malocclusion.

Functional or orthopaedic appliances can be used in growing cases but have not been the ideal choice. Intraoral appliance include the use of class III elastics in conjunction with four miniplates inserted in the left and right infrazygomatic crest of the maxillary buttress and between the lower left and right lateral incisors and canines. Levini et al. used the reverse bionator in the treatment of Class III malocclusion cases. Gencer et al. reported about the double-plate appliance in treating Class III malocclusions. This appliance is used in conjunction with a face mask. R. Sukh et al. used a modified tandem appliance for management of developing Class III malocclusion.

Sugawara et al. studied the long term effects of chin cup appliance in growing patients that exhibit mandibular prognathism and short lower facial height whereas Rey et al. used the mandibular cervical headgear in growing Class III patients exhibiting mandibular prognathism. Ramos et al. studied about the efficiency of Class III treatment using facial mask. Canturk et al. described about the Orthopedic correction of Class III malocclusion with palatal expansion and custom protraction headgear.

Surgical correction of Class III malocclusion includes, in most cases, mandibular setback, maxillary advancement or a combination of both. The orthognathic surgical procedure due to its complexity, morbidity and associated risk factors acts as a deterrent in patients opting for this treatment. Hence, in this patient population, the preference of class three corrections has been camouflage orthodontic treatment. The camouflage treatment is the dental compensation for a maxillomandibular discrepancy. The traditional way of Class III camouflage treatment mainly includes Class III elastics. Class III elastics increase the proclination of upper incisors and extrude the upper molars, resulting in an unesthetic smile and clockwiserotation of the mandible. To avoid this, several studies have reported mini-implant-assisted distalization of lower dentition. Yu-Jin Seouset al. studied camouflage treatment about rapid maxillary expansion and mandibular distalization in a skeletal Class III malocclusion using the palatal mini-implants. Fang Ninget al. stated about the camouflage treatment in adult skeletal Class III cases by extraction of two lower premolars.

In this case series, simplified treatment mechanics were designed based on patient treatment preference and extent of malocclusion. Case described here is a skeletal class III patient with straight profile and crowding of the arches and anterior crossbite. The extraction of lower incisor in this case is favourable because it helps in maintaining the facial profile and also in the correction of lower anterior crowding. The correction of upper anterior crowding was achieved by mild proclination and proximal stripping of the upper anteriors. The farther the maxillary anteriors are proclined, the greater would be the risk of development of black triangles. In this case when the upper anteriors were flared minimally, black triangles were developed between incisors. This was corrected by proximal slicing of anteriors by 2mm totally.

The case described here is a skeletal Class III patient with concave facial profile and spacing in the upper and lower anterior teeth and anterior crossbite. Therefore, alignment and levelling and the upper and lower incisor correction could be concurrently achieved. As a result, oral function and dentofacial esthetics rapidly improved while surgical risks were avoided. The occlusal bite was raised using posterior bite plane and eliminated upper anterior tooth interference was vital for retraction of the lower anterior teeth. During treatment, the labial and lingual inclinations of the incisors altered and the lower molars relation was changed to Class I. Insufficient overjet in results in edge-to-edge bite. Extraction of lower single incisors helped to achieve overjet and I canine relation.
V. Conclusion

Camouflage treatment has proved to be one of the most important and preferred treatment modalities for class III malocclusion. The possibility of ideal camouflage treatment with simplified mechanics in Class III malocclusion will depend upon the extent of class III malocclusion. Recent advances such as the use of bone screws and miniplates have enhanced the prognosis of class III camouflage treatment.
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